

*In the Claims, amend the claims as follows:*

1. (Originally presented) An automated method for measuring benefits accruing from the management of knowledge in a self-assessing knowledge sharing community, or a plurality of communities and sub-communities, said method comprising the steps of:
  - storing knowledge assets in a repository, preferably in a computer-readable format,
  - cataloguing of knowledge assets for easy retrieval by classifying them against a multi-dimensional knowledge hierarchy,
  - receiving new knowledge assets from members of the community,
  - validating, reviewing and rating of the new knowledge assets by assigned members of the community,
  - storing and publishing the validated knowledge in the repository,
  - reviewing and rating of published knowledge assets by any member of the community,
  - calculating a composite rating for knowledge assets based on an aggregation of ratings and usage over time of the knowledge assets in the community,
  - calculating an aggregate rating for a member in each community based on the contributions of the member to the community,
  - calculating an aggregate rating for each community based on the ratings of all its members, and
  - calculating and displaying on a scoreboard, various ratings for members, communities, and sub-communities.
2. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein knowledge assets include documents, discussion threads, profiles of experts, and records of knowledge sharing sessions.
3. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising the step of aggregating knowledge assets from a central repository with those from a plurality of satellite repositories.

4. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein cataloguing of knowledge assets is determined by a multi-dimensional knowledge hierarchy used for the classification of all types of knowledge assets in the knowledge repository including expert profiles, for the selection of reviewers for reviewing submitted assets, and for the organization of sub-communities into communities.
5. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the metrics for rating knowledge assets also determine the metrics for calculating the contributions of a member or community, for rewarding members for their contributions, and for calculating the overall benefits to a community.
6. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the rating and reviewing of knowledge assets by assigned members at the time of publishing comprises the steps of:
  - selecting one or more reviewers by matching the knowledge nodes and paths of the asset with those of the expert profiles of members in the community, using the knowledge hierarchy,
  - assigning of ratings to the knowledge assets by the reviewer(s), and
  - entering of comments by the reviewer visible to all members of the community as well as private comments visible only to the author(s) of the knowledge asset.
7. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 6, wherein the rating and associated comments of each knowledge asset by a reviewer can be revised repeatedly.
8. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 6, wherein the step of assignment of ratings by a reviewer to the knowledge asset includes:
  - normalizing the rated points to a scale of points whose range is determined by the type of the knowledge asset, and,
  - awarding the rated points to each of the author(s) of the knowledge asset either in their entirety or with an apportionment in the case of a plurality of authors.

9. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 6, wherein a predetermined fraction of the maximum number of points possible in the range of points for the type of the reviewed knowledge asset is accrued to the reviewer(s).
10. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein reviewing and rating of a knowledge asset after publishing can be conducted by any member of the community other than an author or reviewer of the knowledge asset along with comments that are accessible to all members of the community.
11. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 10, wherein the rating of each published knowledge asset and associated comments can be revised repeatedly if desired.
12. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 10, wherein the rating assigned to a knowledge asset by a member is accrued to the knowledge asset.
13. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 10, wherein the ratings assigned by a member to a knowledge asset includes:
  - normalizing the rated points to a scale of points whose range is determined by the type of the knowledge asset, and,
  - accrual of the rated points to each of the authors of the knowledge asset either in their entirety or with an apportionment in case of a plurality of authors.
14. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 10, wherein a predetermined fraction of the maximum number of points possible in the range of points for the type of the knowledge asset rated is accrued to the member who contributes the rating.
15. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein calculating the composite ratings of knowledge assets comprises the steps of calculating:
  - reviewer ratings as the arithmetic mean of all the reviewer ratings given to the knowledge asset,
  - member ratings as the arithmetic mean of all the member ratings given to the knowledge asset,
  - frequency of usage as a fraction in exponential relation to the ratio of the

number of times the knowledge asset is used by members to the arithmetic mean of the numbers of times all knowledge assets of the same type in the community are used by members,

- recency of usage as a discrete integral over time of the product of the arithmetic mean of the ratings given to the knowledge asset by members in a window, from a set of windows of equal time intervals, and a corresponding fraction from a predetermined set of time-varying fractions that sum up to 1.0,
- the weighted sum of the reviewer rating, member rating, frequency of usage and recency of usage, where the weight for reviewer rating is greater than the weight for member rating and the sum of the four weights is equal to 1.0,
- the composite rating for the knowledge asset as the weighted sum normalized to a predetermined scale.

16. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 15 wherein the weighted sum is normalized on a scale of 1 to 10.
17. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 1 further comprising the step of retrieving knowledge assets against nodes in the knowledge hierarchy, in combination with keywords, dates, and other query elements, in either descending or ascending order of their composite ratings.
18. (Originally presented) The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein calculating the aggregate rating of a member or a former member in a particular community further comprises the steps of calculating:
  - reviewer accruals as zero for former members and, for current members, as the sum of the points, over all reviews of knowledge assets done by the member in the community or any of its sub-communities,
  - member rating accruals as zero for former members and, for current members, as the sum of the points, over all ratings of knowledge assets in the community or any of its sub-communities done by the member,

- author accruals from reviewers as the sum of the points, over all reviews of knowledge assets authored by the member in the community or any of its sub-communities,
- author accruals from members as the sum of the points, over all ratings of knowledge assets authored by the member in the community or any of its sub-communities, and
- the aggregate rating as the sum of the reviewer accruals, member rating accruals, author accruals from reviewers and author accruals from members.

19. (Canceled)

20. (Canceled)

21. (Canceled)

23. (Canceled)

24. (Canceled)

25. (Canceled)

26. (Canceled)

27. (Canceled)

28. (Canceled)

29. (Canceled)

30. (Canceled)

31. (Canceled)
32. (Canceled)
33. (Canceled)
34. (Canceled)
35. (Canceled)
36. (Canceled)
37. (Canceled)
38. (Originally presented) An automated system for measuring benefits accruing from the management of knowledge in a self-assessing knowledge sharing community, or a plurality of communities and sub-communities, comprising:
  - a repository for storing knowledge assets preferably in a computer-readable format,
  - a catalogue for cataloguing the knowledge assets for easy retrieval by classifying them against a multi-dimensional knowledge hierarchy,
  - means for receiving new knowledge assets from members of the community,
  - means for validating, reviewing and rating of the new knowledge assets by assigned members of the community,
  - means for storing and publishing the validated knowledge in the repository,
  - means for reviewing and rating of published knowledge assets by any member of the community,
  - calculating means for a composite rating for knowledge assets based on an aggregation of ratings and usage over time of the knowledge assets in the community,

- calculating means for an aggregate rating for a member in each community based on the contributions of the member to the community,
- calculating means for an aggregate rating for each community based on the ratings of all its members, and
- means for calculating and displaying on a scoreboard various ratings for members, communities, and sub-communities.

39. (Canceled)

40. (Canceled) .

41. (Canceled)

42. (Canceled)

43. (Canceled)

44. (Canceled)

45. (Canceled)

46. (Canceled) .

47. (Canceled)

48. (Canceled)

49. (Canceled)

50. (Canceled)

51. (Canceled)

52. (Canceled)

53. (Canceled)

54. (Canceled)

55. (Canceled)

56. (Canceled)

57. (Canceled)

58. (Canceled)

59. (Originally presented) A computer program product comprising computer readable program code stored on computer readable storage medium embodied therein for providing an automated system for measuring benefits accruing from the management of knowledge in a self-assessing knowledge sharing community, or a plurality of communities and sub-communities, comprising:

- computer readable program code configured for storing knowledge assets in a repository, preferably in a computer-readable format,
- computer readable program code configured for cataloguing the knowledge assets for easy retrieval by classifying them against a multi-dimensional knowledge hierarchy,
- computer readable program code configured for receiving new knowledge assets from members of the community,
- computer readable program code configured for validating, reviewing and rating of the new knowledge assets by assigned members of the community,
- computer readable program code configured for storing and publishing the validated knowledge in the repository,
- computer readable program code configured for reviewing and rating of published knowledge assets by any member of the community,



- computer readable program code configured for calculating a composite rating for knowledge assets based on an aggregation of ratings and usage over time of the knowledge assets in the community,
- computer readable program code configured for calculating an aggregate rating for a member in each community based on the contributions of the member to the community,
- computer readable program code configured for calculating an aggregate rating for each community based on the ratings of all its members, and
- computer readable program code configured for calculating and displaying on a scoreboard various ratings for members, communities, and sub-communities.

60. (Canceled)

61. (Canceled)

62. (Canceled)

63. (Canceled)

64. (Canceled)

65. (Canceled)

66. (Canceled)

67. (Canceled)

68. (Canceled)

69. (Canceled)

70. (Canceled)

71. (Canceled)

72. (Canceled)

73. (Canceled)

74. (Canceled)

75. (Canceled)

76. (Canceled)